DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 021 **HE 010 487**

AUTHOR	Reed, Jeffrey G.
TITLE	The Effect of Extraneous Circumstances on Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness. Research Report No. 40.
INSTITUTION	Kansas State Univ., Manhattan. Office of Educational Research.
PUB DATE	Jun 77
NOTE	20p.; For related documents see HE 010 486 and HE 010 485
AVAILABLE FROM	Office of Educational Research, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Students; *Effective Teaching; Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Instructional Improvement; Predictor Variables; Questionnaires; Research Projects; School Surveys; State Universities; *Student Attitudes; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Student Teacher Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Instructional Development Effectiveness Assessment; Kansas State University

ABSTRACT

Faculty interviews were used at Kansas State University to identify 24 environmental, student, and faculty variables that were believed to moderate student ratings of teaching effectiveness. The relationship of these variables to criteria derived from the Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment (IDEA) System of KSU was examined. Five "extraneous" variables were useful in explaining criterion variance. Factor analysis group the variables into six factors--respect for students, course experience and control, faculty emphasis on teaching, commitment to course, and teaching style. Questionnaires used in the study are appended. (Author/LBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

KSU

OFFICE OF
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

RESEARCH
REPORT
40

ED160021

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Emalee Hoyt
Kansas State Univ.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 010 487

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
MANHATTAN, KANSAS

Office of Educational Research

Kansas State University

Research Report #40

THE EFFECT OF EXTRANEOUS CIRCUMSTANCES ON STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Jeffrey G. Reed

June 1977

ABSTRACT

Faculty interviews were used to identify 24 environmental, student, and faculty variables which were believed to moderate student ratings of teaching effectiveness. The relationship of these variables to criteria derived from the Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment (IDEA) System of Kansas State University was examined. Five "extraneous" variables were useful in explaining criterion variance. Factor analysis grouped the variables into six factors -- respect for students, course experience and control, faculty emphasis on teaching, commitment to course, and teaching style.

THE EFFECT OF EXTRANEOUS CIRCUMSTANCES ON STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Jeffrey G. Reed

Standardized student evaluations of teaching effectiveness are increasingly being used to assess faculty performance. Both formative and summative evaluation models have been used, resulting in applications ranging from faculty development and self improvement to salary and promotion decisions (Seldin, 1975; Centra, 1977). In view of these diverse uses of student ratings, it is important to identify conditions affecting their validity.

Procedures for using student ratings to evaluate college instruction have been developed at Kansas State University (Hoyt, 1973a, 1973b; CFEDHE, 1975). Its Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment (IDEA) system collects student ratings of progress on instructor-chosen objectives as well as student descriptions of the frequency with which various teaching methods were used. In general, a substantial relationship has been found between the amount of progress on a given objective and the pattern of instructional behaviors exhibited in the classroom. These relationships have been shown to be contingent on class size and a measure of "student motivation" (Hoyt & Cashin, 1977). Adjustments are made for these contingencies in reporting indices of overall instructional effectiveness.

Faculty users of the IDEA procedure have expressed concern that other factors not under their control may have an impact on student ratings of progress, the key variables in evaluating teaching effectiveness. This study was designed to expore these concerns.

There were three major foci: the identification and classification of "extraneous variables" which may moderate student ratings of instruction; the examination of the relationship of such variables to indices of teaching effectiveness; and the determination of the degree to which such measures can account for previously unexplained variance in overall ratings of teaching effectiveness. The investigation was conducted in three stages. Methods and results for each stage are described sequentially.

STAGE 1

Method

Subjects. A random sample of 25 Kansas State University faculty members who had used the IDEA system during 1974-75 was chosen. Members of the sample were asked to participate in an interview to gain their reactions to parts of the program. For one reason or another, it was possible to interview only 16 (67 percent) of the sample.

Procedures. Each subject received a letter informing them of the project's purpose, a reply card for arranging an interview time, and an outline of the types of information which was sought. Interviews lasted from 30 to 90 minutes.

Results

A total of 65 different concerns were identified. These were arbitrarily classified into the 11 general areas shown in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 here

Concerns included: the physical facilities, perceptions of course enrollees, status (role) of course in curriculum, course management factors, instructor attitudes and/or circumstances relevant to assignment to the course, and administrative characteristics.

STAGE 2

Method

Instrument. Data from the interview information reported in Table 1 were used to create an appropriate instrument for assessing extraneous circumstances. Duplicate, overlapping, ambiguous, and unmeasurable concerns were identified and used to reduce the number of variables to 24. The Faculty Information Form (FIF), an integral part of the IDEA system, provided measures of 10 of these. A special questionnaire was constructed to assess the remaining 14. Appendix A provides a copy of this device and the relevant portion of the FIF.

Subjects. A random sample of 128 faculty members and graduate teaching assistants who participated in the IDEA system during the Spring, 1976, semester was selected. Members of this sample were asked to complete the questionnaire. A total of 105 (85 percent) returned the completed form and participated in the student rating program.

Data Analyses. Frequency counts, proportions, and descriptive statistics were compiled for the 24 extraneous variables as well as for 4 measures of teaching methods and 2 teaching effectiveness measures provided by the IDEA system. The teaching methods measures (Involving Students, Communicating Content and Purpose, Creating Enthusiasm, and Preparing Examinations), were used as "standard" predictors. The two teaching effectiveness measures (criteria) were based on student ratings of their progress on objectives emphasized by the instructor. The first was an unadjusted overall evaluation, which simply weighted the progress rating by the instructor's rating of importance. The second adjusted these ratings in light of the class size and the level of student motivation (a measure routinely provided by the IDEA program). Both criterion measures were reported in T-Score form.

TABLE 1

FACTORS WHICH FACULTY FEEL HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS:
Interview Information

1. Condition of the Classroom:
   a. extraneous noise: halls, wind, outdoors (mowers, etc.)
   b. temperature (hot/cold)
   c. lighting (glaring/dim)
   d. objectionable odors (chemicals, etc.)
   e. fixed seating room used for seminar

2. Class size:
   a. too large for discussions
   b. overcrowded for room & facilities
   c. huge room for a small class

3. Class meetings:
   a. Time: early, late, meal time, night
   b. Day of week: Monday morning, Friday afternoon

4. Student Characteristics:
   a. intellectual curiosity
   b. motivation level of individuals
   c. communication skills (writing, speaking)
   d. background and preparation for the course
   e. age/maturity
   f. student level (freshman/sophomore/junior/senior/grad)
   g. general ability (quality) of students
   h. attitude (serious/frivolous) toward education
   i. personal problems (present/absent)
   j. majors/non-majors enrolled

5. Course Status:
   a. required for majors
   b. required for non-majors
   c. elective
   d. required for a degree
   e. pre-requisite for other courses
   f. course pre-requisites: met/unmet; many/few
   g. course level: introductory/intermediate/advanced

6. Type of course (section being evaluated):
   a. lecture
   b. laboratory
   c. recitation
   d. seminar
   e. tutorial

7. Student expectations:
   a. pre-course pre-conceived notions
   b. relevancy of the material
   c. material to be covered, important points, etc.
   d. how taught (different sections handled differently)
   e. competition with other courses for time

8. Course Management:
   a. Classroom policies:
      (1) alphabetical seating
      (2) attendance recording
      (3) prohibition of somking, drinking, eating, etc.
   b. Course Requirements:
      (1) amount of homework, number of assignments
      (2) amount of reading
      (3) difficulty of materials
   c. Grading practices:
      (1) grading policies
      (2) competency/mastery based evaluation
      (3) difficulty of examinations
   d. Textbook/reading materials:
      (1) selected by the instructor/a committee/another
      (2) currency
      (3) readability
   e. Teaching:
      (1) level of instruction (for A student/for C student)
      (2) syllabus used/not used
      (3) syllabus followed/not followed
      (4) method of instruction used is preferred/not preferred
   f. Course changes since previously taught:
      (1) major/minor/none
   g. Examinations/assignments: control/lack of control

9. Instructor:
   a. level: Prof./Assoc./Asst./Instr./GTA
   b. desire to teach the specific course evaluated
   c. teaching load (other preparations)
   d. pressure to do research or publish
   e. department's emphasis on teaching
   f. time available to prepare a newly assigned course
   g. lack of interest in course due to repeated teaching
   h. team teaching:
      (1) separate evaluations of instructors
      (2) student discrimination among instructors involved
      (3) laboratory/lecture leader differentiated

10. Student Evaluations:
    a. timing, relative to course work, papers, tests, etc.
    b. student's seriousness & understanding of evaluation uses
    c. proportion of students evaluating
    d. type of students evaluating (good students/poor students)
    e. required to be administered

11. Other comments:
    a. support for the course:
       (1) graduate assistants
       (2) clerical staff: typing, duplicating, etc.

Since a central problem was to account for variance in the criterion measures, three separate multiple regression analyses were undertaken. The first employed the four measures of teaching methods as predictors. The second used the 24 measures of extraneous variables as predictors. Finally, an attempt was made to determine if the extraneous variables could account for any of the unexplained variance in the criteria after the teaching methods measures had been taken into account; after forcing inclusion of the teaching method scores, a stepwise procedure was employed to add any significant extraneous variables.

Results

Descriptive statistics revealed that the sample included a broad cross-section of the University. For example, 29 percent were teaching the evaluated course for the first time while 11 percent had taught the course 9 or more times in the past. About 40 percent of the classes were in basic or applied sciences, and nearly as many were in social-behavioral sciences; humanities-fine arts made up about 20 percent of the sample. About one-third of the sample were assistant professors, while the remainder were evenly divided among other ranks.

Results of the three multiple regression analyses are shown in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 here

Beta weights were significant for four extraneous variables (Faculty Estimate of Student Motivation, Level of the Course, Research Emphasis in the Field of Study, and Adverse Environment). The first three of these accounted for 25.4 percent of the variance in the unadjusted criterion, while the last two accounted for 10.8 percent of the variance in the adjusted criterion (Multiple correlations of .504 and .329, respectively). Measures of Teaching Methods were powerful predictors, accounting for 67.7 percent of the unadjusted criterion variance (R = .823) and 35.0 percent of the adjusted criterion variance (R = .592). The scale labeled "Preparing Examinations", however, made no independent contribution to prediction.

The measures of Teaching Methods accounted for such a large proportion of the variance that only two extraneous variables added significantly--Level of the Course and Students' Ability to Judge Course Benefits. By adding these two variables, it was possible to account for an additional 2 percent of variance in the unadjusted criterion and 5 percent in the adjusted criterion.

It was decided to retain for further study the five extraneous variables which were significant. Seven other measures were also retained on the basis of separate analyses for social science, science, and humanities courses (not reported here). Four additional measures routinely collected by the FIF were also retained for further study.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF REGRESSION ANALYSES RELATING
TEACHING METHODS & EXTRANEOUS VARIABLES TO TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES

	Effectiveness I (Unadjusted)		Effectiveness II (Adjusted)	
	Beta	r	Beta	r
Extraneous Variables Only:				
Faculty estimate of Student Motivation	.262	.38	n.s.	-
Research Emphasis in Field of Study	.278	.27	.277	.25
Level of the Course	.227	.35	n.s.	-
Adverse Environment	n.s.	-	.209	.18
		R=.504		R=.329
Teaching Methods + Extraneous Variables:				
I. Involving Students	.325	.75	(-.016)	.47
II. Communicating Content & Purpose	.274	.76	.265	.56
III. Creating Enthusiasm	.287	.77	.303	.56
IV. Preparing Examinations	(.004)	.42	(.109)	.35
		R=.823		R=.592
Level of the Course	.140	.35	n.s.	-
Students' ability to judge course benefits	n.s.	-	.238	.01
		R=.833		R=.630

NOTE: Values in ( ) were not statistically significant (Teaching Methods), but were retained in regression equations
n.s. indicates that the value was not statistically significant for that extraneous variable

STAGE 3

Method

Instrument. A new questionnaire was prepared to measure the seven extraneous variables not covered by the FIF (perceived student motivation, student communication skill, faculty duties interfering with teaching, faculty interest in teaching, students' ability to judge course benefits, appropriateness of enrollees' background, and environmental adversity). (See Appendix B.) Measures of the remaining nine variables were obtained from the FIF.

Subjects. A random sample of 154 faculty members and graduate teaching assitants was drawn from those who participated in the IDEA program during the fall, 1976, semester. Members of the sample were asked to complete the new (seven item) questionnaire. A total of 134 (87 percent) did so and participated in the evaluation program.

Data Analyses. Frequency counts, proportions, and descriptive statistics were prepared. Regression equations from the previous analysis were cross-validated. New multiple regression analyses were performed using data from both the Spring and Fall samples. Finally, a principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed using measures of the 16 extraneous variables common to the total sample (Fall and Spring).

Results

Descriptive statistics for the Fall sample revealed that again a broad cross-section of the University was included. The Fall sample resembled the Spring group very closely on nearly every measure, including discipline, course level, faculty rank, and student level.

The six regression equations developed in Stage 2 were cross-validated using data from the Fall sample. Results are shown in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 here

The amount of shrinkage was relatively small for the four equations which incorporated the standard measures of teaching methods. However, sizeable shrinkage occurred when only measures of extraneous variables were considered. Either the two samples differed in some significant way or the beta weights derived from the original analysis were unstable. Since descriptive data for the two samples were so similar, the latter is the more likely possibility.

In an effort to increase the stability of these weights, data from the two samples were pooled and new regression analyses were performed.

TABLE 3

ORIGINAL & CROSS-VALIDATION CORRELATIONS
FOR TWO MEASURES OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

	Effectiveness I (Unadjusted)		Effectiveness II (Adjusted)	
	Original R	Cross-Val. r	Original R	Cross-Val. r
Teaching Methods	.823	.784	.592	.557
Extraneous Variables	.504	.349	.329	-.075
Methods + Extraneous Variables	.833	.795	.630	.568

Results are shown in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 here

Although these data were relatively congruent with those of Table 2, they suggest that the Spring analyses may have exaggerated the impact of extraneous variables. Since Table 4 is based on a much larger sample, cross-validation of its results should be more successful.

In an attempt to conceptualize the nature of the variables reflecting extraneous circumstances, a factor analysis of the pooled data was undertaken. A total of six factors were extracted (minimum eigenvalue of .98), accounting for 62.1 percent of the variance. Suggested factor names, and the variables with important loadings on each, are shown in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 here

The first factor was labeled "Respect for Students" since it appeared to reflect faculty satisfaction with enrollees. Factor II identified the amount of faculty experience with the course as a major dimension of "extraneous circumstances". The third factor, "Teaching Emphasis", was concerned with the relative importance of teaching to the faculty member. The other three factors appeared to represent elaborations of this interest as it interacts with specific conditions--course improvement efforts (Factor IV), competing faculty responsibilities (Factor V), and individualization of teaching (Factor VI). The coherence of this conceptual scheme confirms the widely held belief that teaching is done under very different circumstances; it also suggests that these circumstances can be depicted with appropriate measures.

DISCUSSION

A number of limitations should be acknowledged. The factors investigated were those identified by a sample of 16 participants in a student evaluation of instruction program at one university; conceivably, a larger sample of users, a sample of non-participants, and faculty members from other universities might have identified other factors. The adequacy of the measuring devices--both the student evaluation form and the questionnaires used to measure extraneous variables--was assumed, but not proved; reservations on this matter are especially pertinent to the surveys which were constructed for this investigation. The samples from which the primary data were drawn were relatively small and, again, representative only of the voluntary participants at one university. These limitations provide a framework for the following discussion.

TABLE 4

REGRESSION ANALYSES FOR SPRING & FALL DATA COMBINED

	Effectiveness I (Unadjusted)		Effectiveness II (Adjusted)	
	Beta	r	Beta	r
Extraneous Variables Only:				
Faculty estimate of Student Motivation	.226	.36	n.s.	-
Research Emphasis in Field of Study	.218	.20	.141	.13
Level of the Course	.151	.27	.131	.12
Adverse Environment	-.156	-.30	n.s.	-
		R=.462		R=.185
Teaching Methods + Extraneous Variables:				
I. Involving Students	.260	.71	(.025)	.44
II. Communicating Content & Purpose	.352	.76	.478	.58
III. Creating Enthusiasm	.206	.75	.143	.53
IV. Preparing Examinations	(-.030)	.35	(.041)	.27
		R=.805		R=.584
Level of the Course	.113	.27	n.s.	-
Faculty Estimate of Student Motivation	.101	.36	n.s.	-
Research Emphasis in Field of Study	-.080	-.20	n.s.	-
Students' ability to judge course benefits	n.s.	-	-.180	.03
		R=.825		R=.607

NOTE: Values in ( ) were not statistically significant (Teaching Methods), but were retained in regression equations
n.s. indicates that the value was not statistically significant for that extraneous variable

TABLE 5

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE 16 RETAINED EXTRANEOUS VARIABLES THOUGHT TO AFFECT TEACHER/COURSE EVALUATIONS USING THE COMBINED DATA SET (N = 239)

Variable	Rotated Factor Loadings
FACTOR 1. Respect for Students. (E = 3.24; 20.3% of variance)	
Appropriateness of student enrollment.	.80
Faculty estimate of student motivation.	-.76
Students' ability to judge course benefits.	.63
Level of the course.	-.59
Level of the students.	-.57
Communication skill proficiency.	.53
FACTOR 2. Course Experience and Control. (E = 1.73; 10.8% of variance)	
Faculty rank.	-.78
Number of times taught this course.	.73
Made major course decisions.	-.60
Level of the course.	.49
Level of the students.	.45
FACTOR 2. Teaching Emphasis. (E = 1.50; 9.4% of variance)	
More interested in teaching vs. research.	.74
Course area (emphasis on research).	-.67
Felt about teaching this course.	.36
FACTOR 4. Course Improvement. (E = 1.36; 8.5% of variance)	
Changes made from previous teaching of the course.	.73
Communication skill proficiency.	-.47
Made major course decisions.	.42
Course area (emphasis on research).	-.31
FACTOR 5. Course Commitment. (E = 1.12; 7.0% of variance)	
Other responsibilities interfered with the course.	.79
Felt about teaching this course.	-.58
FACTOR 6. Teaching Style. (E = .98; 6.1% of variance)	
Instructional methods used.	.82
Adverse affect on the course of the physical environment.	-.46
Level of the course.	.31

NOTE: Factor loadings of absolute size less than .30 are excluded. E indicates eigenvalue.

Do faculty members sense that "mitigating circumstances" cloud the meaning of student evaluations of instruction? The study suggests a strong affirmative answer to this question. All interviewees identified a number of such conditions. The factor analytic study suggests that they can be meaningfully classified into six types of conditions--quality of students, faculty experience with the course, faculty attitudes toward teaching, course innovations, interference from other duties, and closeness of the teacher to the student. Since classes can be relatively clearly distinguished on these factors, it is not surprising that faculty members feel such factors need to be considered in interpreting student ratings of their instructional effectiveness.

Was there support for the suspicion that extraneous factors affect student evaluations? Measures of such factors, when optimally combined, predicted the unadjusted criterion with a multiple correlation of about .50; this shrank to about .35 on cross-validation. However, when the criterion was adjusted for class size and level of student motivation, the original multiple R (.33) shrank to zero on cross-validation. Estimates based on pooled data support the belief that at least some extraneous variables are related to student ratings of instructional effectiveness.

Much of the variability in evaluation measures can be accounted for by differences in teaching methods. Can extraneous variables account for some of the "unexplained" variation in criterion measures? These data suggest an affirmative answer to this question. However, the amount of additional variance accounted for was minimal--about three percent. Obviously, even though such measures did predict effectiveness, they overlapped with measures of teaching methods so much that little additional variance was explained.

In other words, "extraneous circumstances" appear to have an impact both on student ratings of progress and on the faculty member's teaching effort. To the degree that these circumstances were viewed negatively by the faculty member, they probably served to discourage him/her and, thus, to inhibit quality teaching. This interpretation is consistent with the findings that, while extraneous factors did predict effectiveness ratings, they added only slightly to the explanatory power of the measures of teaching methods.

When class size and student motivation are taken into account, measures of teaching quality (methods) accounted for only 31.0 percent of the variation in the teaching effectiveness index (cross-validation); this figure was increased to 32.3 percent when relevant extraneous variables were added. Given the measures available in this investigation, most of the variation in the adjusted criterion was "unexplained". Inasmuch as the measure of effectiveness is of critical importance to both faculty development programs and merit evaluation systems, it is important to account for a much larger portion of this variance through more sophisticated measures of the teacher, the course, and/or the student. (e. g., Morey, et. al., 1977). Otherwise, faculty members may be held accountable for student progress which, in reality, was largely a function of other variables.

REFERENCES

Centra, J. A. The how and why of evaluating teaching. In J. A. Centra, ed, Renewing and Evaluating Teaching. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 17, Spring, 1977. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

CFEDHE (Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education). Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment (IDEA) System. Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS, 1975.

Hoyt, D. P. Identifying effective instructional procedures. Improving College and University Teaching, 1973, 21, 73-76. (a)

Hoyt, D. P. Measurement of instructional effectiveness. Research in Higher Education, 1973, 1, 367-378. (b)

Hoyt, D. P., & Cashin, W. E. IDEA Technical Report No. 1: Development of the IDEA System. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS, 1977.

Morey, T. M., Garthwaite, R. A., & Zimoswky, M. F. Ideal, Actual, and Importance Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness: A search for validity. A paper presented at the 49th Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL, May 5-7, 1977.

Seldin, P. How Colleges Evaluate Professors: Current policies and practices in evaluating classroom teaching performance in Liberal Arts Colleges. New York, NY: Blythe-Pennington, Ltd., 1975.

APPENDIX A-1

QUESTIONS FROM THE FACULTY INFORMATION FORM
SUPPLYING DATA FOR THE SPRING SAMPLE

(1) Course Area. (1) Sciences (2) Social Sciences (3) Humanities/Fine Arts

(2) Course Level. (1) Introductory (2) Intermediate (3) Advanced

(3) How many times (prior to this term) have you taught this course? _____

(4) If you have taught this course previously, was your approach this term significantly different? (1) yes (2) no

(5) How did you feel about teaching this course?
(1) Wanted to (2) Neutral (3) Would prefer not to

(6) Did you make the decisions which defined major features in this course (objectives, assignments, exams, etc.)?
(1) yes (2) partly (3) no

(7) Faculty Rank. (1) Professor (2) Associate Professor
(3) Assistant Professor (4) Instructor
(5) Graduate Teaching Assistant/Assistant Instructor

(8) Please estimate the percentage of students in this course who were well motivated.
(1) under 25% (2) 25% to 75% (3) over 75%

(9) Considering all sections, estimate the percentage of enrollees in this course who are:
Freshmen or Sophomores _____% Juniors or Seniors _____%
Graduate Students _____%

(Coded: (1) More than 65% Freshman or Sophomores
(2) Even split among undergraduates
(3) More than 65% Juniors or Seniors
(4) Mixture of Upperclass and Graduates
(5) More than 65% Graduate students)

(10) Which of the following instructional methods do you use most frequently in this course? (check no more than 3)

_____ Lecture	_____ Laboratory	_____ Discussion
_____ Demonstration	_____ Independent Study	_____ Audio-Tutorial
_____ Studio Instruction	_____ Other	

(Coded: (1) Lecture, minimum of student contact
(2) Laboratory, Discussion, Demonstration, Combination of methods, moderate student contact
(3) Independent Study, Studio Instruction, much student contact

APPENDIX A-2

FACTORS AFFECTING TEACHER-COURSE EVALUATIONS

Faculty Responses will be considered confidential. Because the design of the study calls for your responses on this questionnaire to be related to the student evaluations for your course, we need to have your name and course number. However, information which would identify you, or your responses, will not be released. Please check the most appropriate response for each question.

FACULTY MEMBER: _____ DEPARTMENT: _____

COURSE NUMBER: _____ COURSE NAME: _____

1. How proficient were class members in communication skills (writing, speaking, etc.)?
   _____ a. very proficient
   _____ b. adequate, communication posed no major obstacles to class progress
   _____ c. lack of proficiency in communication created problems in achieving class objectives
   _____ d. unable to judge

2. In terms of previous background (familiarity with the subject) how well prepared were students?
   _____ a. background of the class was an asset to reaching my objectives
   _____ b. background of the class was neither an asset nor a liability
   _____ c. background of the class was a liability in reaching my objectives
   _____ d. unable to judge

3. Please estimate how closely student expectations of the course matched your own expectations in terms of purposes and content.
   _____ a. highly congruent _____ b. reasonably similar
   _____ c. noticeably different _____ d. unable to judge

4. Have your other responsibilities (other teaching, research, service) made it necessary for you to neglect this course this semester?
   _____ a. yes, frequently _____ b. yes, occasionally _____ c. no, hardly ever

5. Considering everything, how does your interest in teaching compare with your interest in research?
   _____ a. teaching is of more interest to me than research
   _____ b. about equal in interest
   _____ c. research is of more interest to me than teaching

6. In terms of your professional career, how important is a record of good teaching, compared to a record of research productivity?
   _____ a. teaching record is more important
   _____ b. teaching and research are about equal in importance
   _____ c. research record is more important

7. When did you first learn that you would teach this course during the current semester?
   _____ a. On or before September 30, 1975
   _____ b. Between October 1, 1975 and December 21, 1975
   _____ c. After December 21, 1975

8. College courses differ in terms of how obvious their benefits are to currently enrolled students. (For some courses, students don't realize the benefits until they take subsequent courses, or until they are employed.) In this course, it is my estimation that:
   _____ a. current enrollees can make useful judgements of benefits
   _____ b. judgements of current enrollees, while not irrelevant, will be seriously incomplete
   _____ c. current enrollees simply can't judge benefits until they've had much more experience

9. What percentage of enrollees have interests, abilities, and motivations appropriate for this course?
   _____ a. the majority _____ b. about half
   _____ c. a minority _____ d. unable to judge

10. Do you use classroom management techniques such as alphabetical seating, attendance recording, prohibition of eating or drinking in class, etc.?
    _____ a. I established some definite "ground rules"
    _____ b. No, there were no special regulations instituted

11. How did the size of the classroom/laboratory correspond with the size of the enrollment?
    _____ a. enrollment too large, facilities are crowded
    _____ b. enrollment matched physical facilities quite well
    _____ c. facility was too large, too much empty space

12. Has your effectiveness in this course been impaired by inadequate assistance (quality and/or quantity) from G.T.A.'s and/or the clerical staff?
    _____ a. yes, definitely _____ b. yes, to a degree _____ c. no, not noticeably

13. Did the size of the enrollment in this course force you to use teaching methods which you would prefer not to use?
    _____ a. yes, definitely _____ b. yes, to a degree _____ c. no

14. Did the physical condition of the classroom adversely affect the course (e.g., extraneous noise, obnoxious odors, improper lighting, poorly regulated temperature)?
    _____ a. yes, definitely _____ b. yes, to a degree _____ c. no, not noticeably

THANK YOU. PLEASE RETURN COMPLETED FORM (via. PRE-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE) TO EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES, FAIRCHILD 215.

APPENDIX B

FACTORS AFFECTING TEACHER-COURSE EVALUATIONS

Faculty Responses will be considered confidential. Because the design of this study calls for your responses on this questionnaire to be related to the student evaluations for your course, we will need to have your name and course number on this form. However, information which would identify you, or your responses, will not be released. Please check the most appropriate response for each question. Thank you.

FACULTY MEMBER: _____ DEPARTMENT: _____

COURSE NUMBER: _____ COURSE NAME: _____

1. Please estimate the percentage of students in this course who were well motivated.
   _____ a. Under 25% _____ b. 25 - 75% _____ c. Over 75%

2. How proficient were class members in communication skills (writing, speaking, etc.)?
   _____ a. proficient
   _____ b. adequate, communication posed no major obstacles to class progress
   _____ c. deficient, communication created problems in achieving class objectives
   _____ d. unable to judge

3. Have your other responsibilities (other teaching, research, service) made it necessary for you to neglect this course this semester?
   _____ a. yes, frequently _____ b. yes, occasionally _____ c. no, hardly ever

4. Considering everything, how does your interest in teaching compare with your interest in research?
   _____ a. teaching is of more interest to me than research
   _____ b. about equal in interest
   _____ c. research is of more interest to me than teaching

5. College courses differ in terms of how obvious their benefits are to currently enrolled students. (For some courses, students don't realize the benefits until they take subsequent courses, or until they are employed.) In this course it is my estimation that:
   _____ a. current enrollees can make useful judgements of course benefits
   _____ b. judgements of current enrollees, while not irrelevant, will be seriously incomplete
   _____ c. current enrollees simply can't judge benefits until they've had much more experience

6. What percentage of enrollees have interests, abilities, and motivations appropriate for this course?
   _____ a. the majority _____ b. about half
   _____ b. a minority _____ d. unable to judge

7. Did the physical condition of the classroom adversely affect the course (e.g., extraneous noise, obnoxious odors, improper lighting, poorly regulated temperature)?
   _____ a. yes, definitely _____ b. yes, to a degree _____ c. no, not noticeably

PLEASE RETURN COMPLETED FORM (via. PRE-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE) TO EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES, FAIRCHILD 215. THANK YOU.